

STAT

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000700050002-2

STAT

c/o THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
2210 - E - STREET. N.W.
WASHINGTON. D.C.

25X1

Dear []:

In last night's Evening Star appeared the attached column by Dorothy Thompson, which is a kind of critique on President Eisenhower's appointment of 34 brain stormers.

In the last sentences which I underlined Miss Thompson may be right but somewhat one-sided as she had to include also the entire list of news paper columnists. They always criticise but never come up with a new idea.

In tonight's Evening Star appeared the attached Editorial A TWO-WAY STREET and in which I underlined also a sentence.

It may be understood that the U.S.A. sent some of its best men to the other side. Which the Russians may have understood also. Nevermind that they were confident that for the American scientists it was impossible to attack the foundations of communism. And as Karl Marx invited, that was exactly the basis on which he welcomed criticism. Any other talk as about freedom and that we are such good boys would be meaningless and non-informative.

To read this from an editor of the Evening Star is astonishing, because his newspaper is full of that meaningless talk.


The curious thing is that an eventual new idea for our Foreign policy could neither be Republican or Democrat because it is founded on a non-political basis, which on the other hand could be embraced by both parties.

However its simplicity would be extremely difficult to be understood, because fundamentally it comes to the point that you had to show that 2 apples plus 2 apples were equal to 4 apples and not to 3 or 5.

It is as with gravity. The Reason of Gravity is really extremely simple but it takes Captain Horn already more than 2 weeks to tell me that I am wrong. Though he wrote me that no scientist can give a definite reason for it. Neither could they tell in Moscou that Karl Marx was wrong.

But without understanding gravity we will never make the fullest use of it and so it will be with communism. Without understanding that its basis is wrong we will never succeed in getting rid of it.

Respectfully yours,


B.G.H. Vanderjagt.

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☒
☐ DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE: 12 MAR 1981 REVIEWER: []

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000700050002-2

STAT

STAT

TRANSMITTAL SLIP DATE *24 Feb 55*
Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000700050002-2

TO:

ROOM *229* *Admin.*

REMARKS

Another one in the series, authored by our Dutch friend who boils it all down to "gravity"! -

FROM:

ROOM NO. *241*

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000700050002-2

FORM NO. 241 REPLACES FORM 36-8 WHICH MAY BE USED.

A Two-Way Street

months
d in the

ians. The
goods and
through
the two
ssibilities,
eady has
achinery
as tech-
ie expan-
les. There
50 million
se banks,
ed by the

een under
epresents
t this in
to restore
two coun-
n, should
tical and
st. Trade
e postwar
ie narrow
t, which
expanded
ice, each
resources
elopment
Thus, the
al barrier
art of the

of varied
A native
Connect-
ingtonian
achieved
oldier and
en more
in Con-
ed States
e he was
ring a
e into an
Finance
expressly
not stem
hough a
ublican"
Bingham
c service
on when
ll Service

returned from a rewarding experience in Russia. During their 10-day visit there, they associated and talked freely—in public places and private homes—with hundreds of Soviet scientists. They have come back knowing considerably more than they knew before they went over, and as a result they are strong advocates of the idea that there should be increasing numbers of such trips on a reciprocal basis.

Among the things learned by these men is the fact that Russia today appears to be a lot less secretive than it used to be. At any rate—and this may well be symptomatic of a fundamental change for the better in the Soviet system—they found themselves at liberty to see all they wanted to see, and their conversations with their hosts were unrestricted. They discussed and debated many subjects ranging from purely scientific matters to delicate political questions, and they could detect no effort to put a gag on anything or steer the talk into meaningless or noninformative channels.

More important still, the visiting Americans were allowed to give a close inspection to concrete evidence—such as cyclotrons—that left no room for doubt that Soviet science is far advanced in the field of physics, particularly in basic nuclear research bearing upon the nature of energy. In fact, according to some of these tourist-experts, the Russians in this respect have already achieved a lead that the United States may not be able to overcome for the next 10 years. And perhaps the biggest reason for their impressive showing is that the Kremlin is placing an enormous amount of money at their disposal.

Such information is well worth having, and it points up the value of exchanging visits with the Soviet Union along the lines advocated by President Eisenhower. This two-way street to knowledge can be traveled without endangering our security; indeed, it may actually help us in that sense. There is no monopoly in the field of abstract or applied science. We can learn from the Russians just as they can learn from us. It would be narrow-visioned of us, and self-denying, if we insisted upon maintaining a wall of intellectual censorship between our two countries.

EVENING STAR

DOROTHY THOMPSON

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000700050002-2

No Foreign Policy Debate Likely

A New Idea on the Subject Seen Vital To Any Campaign Discussion

The slightest remark emanating from a Russian leader warrants cable tolls from anywhere. In Moscow, Premier Bulganin, attending a garden party at the British Embassy and offered some cherries from Italy, refused them on the ground that they were NATO cherries, that there is nothing good about NATO and that, except for NATO, Italy and her cherries would be wonderful. This remark was a front-page story in newspapers here.

The Russian leaders are not worried about NATO. Its troubles are too obvious to inspire in its opponents anything more serious than Premier Bulganin's heavy-handed humor, conveyed, of course, by the Western press.

At the height, presumably, of American power, our political leaders are as fascinated by their Soviet opponents as a rabbit by a snake. All our moves are conditioned by Soviet actions. We seem to have nothing whatever to say for ourselves. What is the reason?

I think the reason is that we ended the war with a very false vision of the future. Our leaders calculated that we would emerge as the only great power whose resources would be intact, and that out of this position we would take over the role of "world policemen" on the pattern of Pax Romana or Pax Britannica, and by military might and a vast expenditure of surplus goods, we would usher in the American century.

There were several things wrong with this idea. The most important error was to believe it could be realized peaceably.

The "Pax Romana" exists only in memory as an age of peace. Rome destroyed her most powerful enemies—in the course of which she also destroyed the Roman republic. Thereafter her legions policed most of the world, but not without perpetual "marginal wars."

Great Britain, at the height of her imperial power, at-

tempted to hold what she had, making one alliance to fit one situation and another for another and was involved in perpetual "police actions."

Rome and Britain were, furthermore, frankly imperialist. They raised and trained imperial castes of soldiers and administrators. Each considered itself, for the time, as entirely justified in keeping the lesser breeds in line.

Neither American history, nor the American practice of government, nor the American mind, fitted her (or will ever fit her, as long as the republic exists) for such a role. We have not been empire builders but empire smashers, standing, at least platonically, for the "right of self-determination."

However, the "right of self-determination" is not a peaceable idea, but a highly explosive one.

So our policy is schizophrenic. What might have been gained by consistent Wilsonianism we lose by alliances with decaying empires. What might have been gained by a real imperial policy is impossible for a democratic people.

There was another alternative: The traditional American policy of aloofness, with (as the late Senator Taft suggested) the extension of the

Monroe Doctrine to certain critical areas.

Actually, we have extended our lines throughout the globe. Today 1.5 million American troops are stationed in 900 places, in few of which they are secure; in none of which they are popular.

They are there to "contain" Soviet forces. But the Soviets, who possess a real imperial idea, to which they are consistent, keep their forces in reserve and move politically and diplomatically in the global areas that American revolutionism (anti-imperialism) has opened to them.

Notice has been given that foreign policy will be debated during the campaign. We predict there will be no debate worth the name. The Democrats are arguing that the policy of the administration has not weakened but strengthened the Communist bloc, and, again, the obsession with communism will dominate. They will call for increased foreign aid. But if "foreign aid" is a policy, we have been outbidding the Soviets ten to one. There can, in fact, be no debate on foreign policy unless, or until, one party or the other comes up with a new idea.

And they won't find it by the recommended "brain storming." We have had little of anything else—and it always seems to be the same storm.

Suburban Office Space

We have several well-located offices available in nearby Maryland areas. Excellent for professional people or business space.

H. G. Smithy Company

Mortgage Representative—The Travelers Insurance Co.

311 15th Street N.W.

STerling 3-3300

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000700050002-2

EVENING STAR